

I note you have a brief amount of time. I will just try to mention some things I do not think have been said, maybe putting this in a different perspective.

When it comes to the topic of Cyprus, there are so many paradoxes involved here. If you go back to September 14, 1829, after a tenacious 8-year battle, Hellenic troops were able to conquer larger Ottoman forces. The Greeks finally won their recognition as a sovereign state. They did that with the support of countries like Russia, Britain, France, and the United States, all supporting a return of democracy to the Greeks.

Yet, now for 21 years, these countries and many others around the world have turned their backs on Cyprus and the situation in Cyprus. It is the Greeks themselves who are credited with the entire concept of democracy. As early as the sixth century B.C., the ideas upon which our own Constitution was written were being debated by the ancient Athenian philosophers. Greeks were the first people to believe all persons are created equal and should be recognized as so, and these people can go and govern their own affairs. Yet, for 21 years on Cyprus, the Greeks who lived there, the Cypriots there, have not been allowed to do that.

Hundreds of years after the Greeks first talked about democracy, our own Founding Fathers referred to the wisdom of Pericles, Plato, and Aristotle in drafting the principles of America's own democracy and Constitution. Yet, we turn our back for 21 years on what has occurred in Cyprus.

When and under what other circumstance would this Nation turn its back on five American citizens captured and held? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] referred to a 17-year-old boy, who is a 38-year-old man, if he is alive. He had his passport in his hand.

The family was there, along with five Americans, along with 1,600 Greek Cypriots, who have not been heard of for 21 years. Yet, our Nation stands by, giving millions of dollars in economic aid to Turkey, giving hundreds of millions of dollars in military aid to Turkey.

In fact, it is amazing, if you take a look at those figures, the amount of money coming from the United States to Turkey is about what it costs that nation to be able to occupy Cyprus each of those 21 years, and every time the United Nations has spoken up on Cyprus, they have found that the Turkish Government has not paid attention. They have ignored everything we have done.

So I say to the gentleman, I am proud to be here on the floor with you commemorating this, and I hope that we never have to do this again, that something before the next anniversary comes up will occur so the people of Cyprus can again know the freedom that Greeks for centuries have talked about and people of this country for 200 years have also spoken about.

#### JOB AND EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### TURKISH-OCCUPIED CYPRUS

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS]. I appreciate it so very much. I will not take the full 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman from New York said, last fall, the President appointed Mr. Richard Beattie as special emissary to Cyprus to lend new impetus in resolving the Cyprus problem. Mr. Beattie, along with State Department Special Cyprus Coordinator, James Williams, have made several trips to Cyprus stressing U.S. resolve in achieving a lasting solution to the problems there.

However, it is evident, Mr. Speaker, that a solution to the 21-year-old problem on Cyprus will not be found until tensions are lessened on the island and the Turkish side agrees to come to the table and negotiate.

I am satisfied that the Government of Cyprus remains committed to seeking a peaceful, just, and viable solution. The acceptance by the Turkish side of U.N. Resolution 939 and of Cyprus President Glafcos Clerides' demilitarization proposal would substantially enhance the prospects of a negotiated settlement.

This past weekend, in my home in Florida, a gentleman said to me that in all the history of the country of Turkey, voluntary negotiations and agreements based on those negotiations are absent. He said, "they don't negotiate."

I truly hope that he is wrong. Turkey has many internal problems. American taxpayer dollars are intended to help them with those problems, not to help them to wage invasions on their neighbors and to illegally occupy other lands. Common sense, a true caring for their own people, their domestic needs, and world opinion all would seem to dictate that Turkey would want to work things out on a problem that they just do not need.

I feel that we in the Congress have a responsibility to use our influence to see that Cyprus is made whole again, to rescue the thousands of Greek-Cypriots who have become refugees in the land of their birth. Like those faithful Cypriots in my district and elsewhere, we must do our utmost in this cause.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education reported its appropriations bill for next year. The bill will be considered by the full committee on Thursday and by the full House next week.

On previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, I made it clear that nothing is more important in this House, nothing that we contemplate and nothing that we legislate on is more important than jobs and education.

□ 2130

And in our complex society jobs and education are inextricably interwoven. We cannot really hope to have a decent job in this complex society unless you do have an education.

When I came to Congress 13 years ago, I volunteered, and I wanted very much, to serve on the Education and Labor Committee. I thought that there would be a lot of competition for service on the committee which deals with education and jobs because in my district of course the most important thing that was clearly communicated to me by my constituents was a need for more jobs. We had one of the highest unemployment levels in the country concentrated in my district. People wanted jobs, they needed jobs, and of course, in order to qualify for some of the better jobs, they needed an education. I saw that right away. I wanted to serve on the Education and Labor Committee, and that was the name of the committee at that time, because of the fact that was the way I felt I could give the greatest amount of service to my constituents.

To my great surprise I found there was no great amount of competition for service on the Education and Labor Committee. The smarter members of the freshman class when I came in all told me that the Education and Labor Committee is a graveyard. You cannot get any contributions for our campaigns by serving on the Education and Labor Committee, and, true to form, I found that it was easy for me to get a place on that committee, and I, of course, still wanted a place, but there were many vacancies on Education and Labor, and year after year there were vacancies, and people came on that committee only after they could not find any other place.

But I think it was a great mistake on the part of those who chose that course. Nothing is more important than jobs and education. Nothing that we do is more important than what we do in order to encourage an economy which produces jobs and an economy which makes it possible for people to work and earn decent wages under conditions that are not life-threatening, under conditions that do not destroy the health of workers, and of course closely added to that is the need for education systems that allow people to qualify for these jobs, allow people to be able to operate and earn their own way in our complex society, and allow people also to meet other requirements in our very complex society.

So jobs and education are very important. They are very important, and in the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget the only area that we propose great increases in the budget,

although we were under the mandate to show a balanced budget over a 7-year period, and we met the mandate, and we balanced the budget over a 7-year period, we were not able to give increases elsewhere, but we did increase the education budget by 25 percent. We recognized that function 500, which is education and job training, was the area that had to be given priority.

It was quite pleasant to note that the President, President Clinton, when he decided to announce his own 10-year budget, chose to emphasize and to clearly make education and job training as a priority. The President proposes to increase over a 10-year period by more than \$40 billion the education and job training budget. So we clearly have set that priority.

We are quite distressed by the fact that the overall Republican budget cuts in domestic spending call for a 4-percent cut over the 4-year period. Most programs will be cut only 4 percent if you average it all out. However the Republican appropriations bill shows that education has the lowest possible priorities because education is cut by 16 percent, not 4 percent, but by 16 percent, or \$3.9 billion is cut out of funding for training and education and an additional 24 percent is cut out of other programs in function 500, labor programs, an additional \$2.7 billion.

Now what does this mean in terms of the contract for America, the contract on America, some of us say the contract against America? What is the vision of the people who are in charge? The Republican majority want to do what in the future? They want to do what in the present? They want to do what in the future which leads them to believe that education and job training should be assigned the lowest possible priorities? The Republicans have clearly said that they want to remake America. We are going to remake America. They are going to remake America this year largely through the appropriations process. They are not able to muster the kind of votes in the Senate that are going to allow them to remake America through an authorization process where committee by committee and bill by bill they would be able to pass a bill which—bills which pass the House, so they are going to do it through the appropriations and budget process.

What do they do with jobs and education? Immediately they communicate to us that in the action taken by the Appropriations Committee the jobs and education are assigned a very low priority. The future of America, as envisioned by the Republicans in control of the House, is a future that does not need to have programs which provide the best possible education for the most people in America. The Nation does not need the best possible education system.

Yes, it is true that the Federal Government does not run the education system in America. Everybody knows

that we all agree that only about 7 percent of the total education budget is money that comes from the Federal Government. The Federal Government plays a minor role in education. But it is a very pivotal role, and it is a role that needs to be expanded, and not cut off, and not diminished.

We have always prided ourselves on leaving education to the States and to the local school districts. Perhaps we have gone overboard. I think we have gone overboard and allowed too much to be left to the States and the local school boards over the years. We are not like France, or Great Britain, or Japan, or Germany. We do not have a highly centralized Department of Education running education for the whole country. We have never had that; there is no danger of us ever falling into that anytime soon in the next 100 years, I assure you, but we go to the other extreme. Instead of not only not having the highly centralized, centralized, overbearing direction of education from a central point, we are out of the picture too much, and the Federal Government has played too small a role, and for that reason our Nation has fallen behind in terms of the competence and productivity of its workers in terms of the reproduction of a labor force that is going to be able to meet the complexities of the future. We are in deep trouble because we have not played enough role. If the Federal Government were merely to get involved a little more, it would not hurt.

In fact, we could easily go to the point where the Federal Government is supplying instead of the present 7 percent of the total education funding, it can supply 25 percent. In fact, we should move toward that goal where at least 25 percent of the total education funding in America is supplied by the Federal Government, and then we would have 25 percent of the decision-making power. Even if we had 25 percent of the decisionmaking power, 75 percent of the decisionmaking power would still be left to the States and to the local governments. So there would be no domination of the Federal Government of education.

We do not need to lessen and diminish our role in education. We need to increase our role in education. It is quite dangerous, any vision of America which says that education is not important. Well, that is the vision that is being offered by the present Republican majority.

Perhaps it is because they are people whose mind-set is shaped by their philosophy that only an elite group can run America and only an elite group needs to get an education. I call them the elite minority that chooses to oppress the majority. Now that is a very difficult phenomenon in a democracy, and the great question is, Will the elite minority that controls the House now and controls the Senate, will an elite minority be able to stampede the great majority of Americans out there into accepting this oppression, accepting

this denial of opportunity through education programs, accepting this large cut in job-training programs? Will the elite minority be able to stampede America, and divert their attention and get them interested in so many other things like abortion, and affirmative action, and voting rights, and various other immigrant-bashing, various other diversionary tactics, allow them to downgrade education, abandon job training, at the same time win votes? That is a great question; we do not know what the answer is going to be.

I assume that the majority of Americans will clearly recognize the threat, the danger, to their own well-being of that kind of philosophy and an elitist group which wants to govern only for that small group. It is a danger to the majority. The majority certainly will have at their disposal the instruments for dealing with that kind of philosophy now that it is clearly revealed.

It was not part of the Contract With America. Whether you like the Contract With America or not, in the Republican Contract With America they never stated we are going to downgrade the Federal involvement in education. They never stated we are going to give less money to job training, and less money to schools, and less money for drug-free schools and safe-schools programs. They never stated that. They never said we are going to cut school lunch programs. They never stated that. They never stated we are going to have fewer job training programs. In fact the impression was given that one of the things they definitely wanted to do was have everybody assume personal responsibility for themselves. The great emphasis was on reforming welfare, taking up the call of the President to change welfare as we know it.

They certainly in the Contract With America said they would do something about welfare in terms of making people move from welfare to jobs, and yet the very area which allows people to move from welfare to jobs is the area of education and job training, and that is the area which the Republicans have chosen to cut the most, the most. Sixteen percent they are cutting in education, 24 percent in other labor and job-training programs, 16 percent, 24 percent, in areas where people need the greatest amount of help in order to become self-sufficient in order to be able to get off welfare, in order to, those not on welfare, to be able to go on and get the kind of training they need for the kind of highly specialized and complex jobs that are opening all the time. We cannot have an America that is moving forward if we do not have every possible opportunity to upgrade the work force, every possible opportunity for people to help themselves.

Are Americans better off now than they were before the Contract With America started? Now that the Contract With America has been completed, are you better off now than you were before, or is the Republican concept of a Contract With America now

out of control? Have they gone into areas where the contract never intended to go because certain people want to get revenge on labor? Certain people want to experiment with their own ideas about education? Certain people see the Federal Government in a way of local experimentation that might be more advantageous for people who want to privatize the schools or who want to pursue certain elitist agendas that cannot be pursued if you have a Federal Government which is trying to set some standards.

Goals 2000 is zeroed out. They do not want anything to do with Goals 2000. Goals 2000 is now zeroed out by the Republican majority, but Goals 2000 was conceived of by a Republican President following the lead of another Republican President. The whole movement toward reform of the public school education began under Ronald Reagan with the report of "A Nation at Risk." It was continued under George Bush when he set forth America 2000 and held a conference where he set forth six goals for American education.

President Clinton was at that Governors' Conference which set those six goals. President Clinton has followed through from America 2000 to Goals 2000. If you like Goals 2000 and America 2000 side by side, you are going to find they have more in common, they have more similarities, than they have differences. One of the big differences of course in America 2000 President Bush was proposing vouchers and greater privatization of schools, and President Clinton removed that completely from Goals 2000, but in spirit the whole idea of establishing standards where every school system could use those standards as a model, not—there is nothing mandated about it, there is nothing—the Federal Government does to force anybody to do anything, but the Republicans want to move away from the establishment of those standards. There was great bipartisan agreement on the establishment of the standards.

Goals 2000 went forward. It was passed, authorized, and funded with bipartisan support. Suddenly this new majority. The people who want to give us a contract have set off on a different course. They want to revolutionize in the wrong direction. Revolution is always a dangerous course. You know revolution is sometimes a necessary evil. You cannot change things any other way except by having a revolution.

But even the best revolutions go wrong. Revolutions are inherently destructive. They move too fast so rapidly, they try to do so much, that inevitably they will do a lot that is wrong. Why? Why have a revolution in an area where we do not need a revolution, where we have an evolution, a steady progress. Slow but steady movement in the right direction is evolution.

□ 2145

We have a pretty rapid evolution in education, an improvement of education. So why throw in a revolution which cuts off the Federal involvement by cutting off all the funds for Goals 2000 and by also rolling back other programs like chapter 1. Been funded for more than 25 years. Started under Lyndon Johnson to help poor school districts. Chapter 1, title I is now being cut drastically by the Republicans, an almost \$1 billion cut.

Head Start for the first time. No Republican President or Democratic President has ever cut Head Start, but Head Start is now being cut by \$200 million by the majority, by the Republican majority in the latest proposals to come out of the subcommittee on the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations. That is what we are up against.

This Contract With America is out of control. The vision that the Republican majority has has to be examined and reexamined, because it is dangerous if it is a vision which sees education as being a low priority.

The assault on education and labor certainly was not openly contemplated or stated as part of the Contract on America, Contract With America. The contract said nothing about moving not only to downgrade education and to cut off job training programs but also to attack the workplace.

There is an assault on the protection of workers in the workplace. There is an assault on the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and all of the laws that they have promulgated to help protect the safety of workers.

Much of this does not cost any money. Small amounts of money are involved, but the appropriations and budget process is being used in order to cut and destroy the effectiveness of these safety and health programs.

They cannot pass bills and get them through the legislative process and get them signed by the executive branch. So in the absence of being able to pass authorizing legislation and get it signed into law, they are using the back-door approach of the budget and appropriations process.

They have cut off large amounts of funding for OSHA, the Occupational Health and Safety organization. They have cut off money for the Mine Safety Health Administration. They have cut off money for the National Labor Relations Board.

The largest cut of organizations and entities designed to help workers has been NLRB. Thirty percent has been cut. These big numbers might be hard to follow, but just consider your budget for your House for a week, and if it took a 30 percent cut, you know what 30 percent means, if you take your salary for 1 month and you take a 30 percent cut, I have some idea what 30 percent means.

These are relatively small agencies of the Federal Government, the OSHA, Occupational Safety and Health Ad-

ministration, the Mine Safety Administration, the research arm of OSHA called NIOSH, all very small pieces. Even the National Labor Relations Board, as comprehensive as it is and as important as it is to labor relations, it is still a small part of the overall executive budget.

So when they make these cuts they do great damage. They make it almost impossible for the agencies to function, and they know that. They are legislating through the appropriations process, crippling the agencies. It is an assault on workers.

And you might say, well, who cares about workers? Well, when we say workers, we do not mean people who are out there digging ditches necessarily, people who haul garbage. Workers are wage earners. Anybody who earns a wage is clearly a worker in the category of what we are talking about, and the vast majority of Americans are people who earn hourly wages or they earn salaries on the basis of hourly wages. They have salaries, but they pretty much work on the same basis as hourly workers. If they work over 40 hours, they want overtime, et cetera.

So you have a vast number of people employed by other people who are wage earners or workers. If you want to call them, working class, middle class, or you can even reach out, include some small entrepreneurs. There are a lot of people with small businesses. They earn less than the average hourly wage earner, but they like the independence.

In fact, one of the things that came out when we were doing the studies on health care last year in preparing health care legislation was that a large percentage of the small business owners of America have no health insurance. A large percentage of those people are independent, and they have their own business, and they deprive pleasure from that, and they contribute greatly to our economy, and we need more of them. They cannot afford to even pay for their own health insurance.

So if you are talking about people working every day and they cannot afford to be without a week's worth of earnings, then you could include large numbers of small businesspeople in the same category.

When you get through adding the hourly workers and the salary people who are really working on an hourly basis and you add to them the entrepreneurs and the small business owners, you are talking about two-thirds of America. You are talking about working conditions and earnings for two-thirds of America. So it is two-thirds out there, at least, that we are talking about when we say that the Contract With America has chosen to assault working people, assault the working class.

The middle class is a working class, anybody who is in those categories I mentioned before.

This assault is about more than money. Yes, the balancing of the budget has been touted as one of the major goals of the Republican majority, and it has been conceded by the White House and a lot of other people that maybe we should be unlike all of the other industrialized nations. Maybe this Nation should work toward a balanced budget. A balanced budget might be a good idea.

It may not be absolutely necessary because there are a lot of other industrialized nations like Germany, France, Britain, Holland, that do not have balanced budgets, and they have larger national debts than we do, and they function pretty well, but let us break ground and lead the other industrialized nations into a situation where we have national balanced budgets.

It might be good idea to save money on interest which is mounting all the time. All of it is worth experimenting with. We will accept the need for a balanced budget.

The President makes much more sense than the Republican majority and the Congress. He says let us do it over a 10-year period. Let us not glorify suffering and pain. Let us try to minimize the suffering and pain. Let us not sit comfortably from our vantage point in the elite upper group expecting a tax cut while we let people suffer in the other two-thirds of the economy. Let us try to balance the budget in a way which is fair and spreads the burden to all of us. Maybe we should even balance the budget slowly and look for new sources of revenue.

In the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, we proposed that we move toward an increase in the burden, the proportion of the burden of revenue of taxation that is borne by corporations. You know, we have in this country a strange phenomenon where since 1943 the amount of money—the percentage or the proportion of the overall tax burden borne by families and individuals has gone from 27 percent to 44 percent. Individuals and families now bear 44 percent of the total tax burden.

Corporations went in the other direction. They bore almost 40 percent of the total tax burden in 1943. They went from almost 40 percent of the total tax burden down to 11 percent. At one point it got as low as 8 percent of the total tax burden.

Stop and think about that. Every American who is angry out there ought to think about what he is angry at.

You have got good reason to be angry. You have been swindled. Over the years, the Committee on Ways and Means has been owned by corporations. Over the years, the Committee on Ways and Means has allowed itself and the Congress, yours truly included, have sat paralyzed when Ways and Means bills are brought to the floor. You cannot amend them. You cannot do anything about them. And we have not fought vigorously enough and exposed what is going on to a great

enough degree to make the American people understand. We have been swindled.

At this point, after adjustments made by the Clinton administration, corporations are carrying about 11 percent of the total tax burden, while individuals and families are paying 44 percent of the total tax burden. And again, under Ronald Reagan it went as low as 8 percent. Corporations were paying as low as 8 percent. So there is good reason to be angry.

But let me come back to my major point here. In the attack on workers, the budget is not of great concern. The numbers and the money is not of great concern. The attack on workers is an attempt to destroy a certain segment of our society, a certain segment of the political infrastructure, a certain segment that does not cater to the philosophy of the elite minority that is in charge now.

That is what we are up against. This assault is designed to destroy the voices and the ability to participate in the political process of two-thirds of the Nation's people. It is assigned to wipe out any influence and any effectiveness that organized labor has. Because organized labor is a very small percentage of the total voting population out there, 16 million and going down, but they have a consolidated solidarity that allows them to have much more influence than the numbers would indicate, and they are one of the few organized forces that is not already controlled by the elite minority that is seeking to change, remake the government of America. They are not under the control of the people who are perpetrating the Contract With America. So they must be destroyed, and that is what this is all about.

The assault on organized labor does not necessarily save money. But it accomplishes another purpose of wiping out the opposition. Couple the two, the assault on education with—an assault on education and job training with an assault on the instrument, the voice, the mechanism by which people can fight for more jobs and better jobs and fight for better education, and you have an indication of what the grand design of the elite minority is.

They have a vision of the future. Their vision of the future and their vision of what America should be is an America that has no room for two-thirds of the people. We are not going to share the great wealth of America with two-thirds of the people. We are going to govern, according to the vision of the elite minority, govern in order to enhance the advantages and refurbish the luxuries of a small elite group, and that is what this grand design was all about.

Turning to education for a minute, let us take a look at some of the cuts that were taken in the education area. Education for disadvantaged students, and Title I program, which supports tutoring and remedial education services for low income children and others who

are falling behind in school, the House bill cuts the program by \$1.1 billion. That is 17 percent. This is in one year. We are talking about the cuts in that 1-year period, not over the 7-year period; 1.1 million educationally disadvantaged students will be out of the program, 1.1 million students around the country.

The House appropriations bill destroys the drug free schools—the drug free and safe schools program. It cuts it 60 percent, eliminating services to 23 million school children.

Adult education programs support literacy training and basic education for adults. The House bill gouges \$25 million out of the program, denying services in this small program to 125,000 adults.

It goes after Head Start, as I stated before. Head Start will have 50,000 fewer children than before. We were proposing that Head Start be increased. George Bush increased Head Start programs. Ronald Reagan increased Head Start programs. For the first time, we have a cut in Head Start programs, after both parties have continually agreed that this was a program that works. It is a program where the funding—and youth employment and training programs, the House bill cuts total training for disadvantaged youth by 54 percent.

To the youth of America, here is the message: Youth of America who are not in school, the programs are cut more than half. If you are in school, we are only cutting 16 percent.

□ 2200

If you are in school, we are only cutting 16 percent, but we care not about the future of the youth of America. We care about putting them in prison, we care about more money for prisons and more money to make certain that law enforcement operations round them up, but we are not interested in educating the youth of America.

To the youth of America we are saying that the summer jobs program, which is already inadequate and funds too few youngsters, will be totally eliminated. It funds about 600,000 youngsters throughout America during the summer months. They get a job if they are low-income youth and they qualify. That is going to be eliminated totally, completely, zero funding is there. For year-round training programs for low-income youth, the cut will be 80 percent. That almost wipes it out. That leaves only 20 percent. Just stop and think, your monthly paycheck or your weekly paycheck, if you cut 80 percent out of it, if you take \$8 out of every \$10, what do you have left? You can understand how this is a destruction of a program. It does not exist anymore if you make that big a cut in the program.

Training for dislocated workers, people who lose their jobs by having large defense plants close. We said they would be a priority. We promised them, we had a contract with them that as we

cut back on the expenditures for defense, workers in those plants would have an opportunity to be relocated, to be retrained, and we had special programs to do that. Now we are suddenly going to cut those programs 34 percent, \$446 million. This will mean that 140,000 worker who are in the program already will be dropped out and no new workers of any substantial amount can come in.

Training for low-income adults, those people on welfare that we yell we wanted to get off welfare and get a job, that will be cut by \$225 million, denying assistance to 74,000 that we now give assistance to to get off welfare, we are going to have that many fewer who will have the opportunity to get jobs and to get off welfare. This is what we mean when we say we are going to reform welfare, change it as we know it.

It is really not necessary to decimate education and training in order to balance the budget. The issue is how we go about reaching the balanced budget and what programs should be given priority as I said before. The Republicans have clearly decided that education is not a priority. Their budget would cut education spending by \$36 billion over the next 7 years. The Congressional Black Caucus, as I mentioned before, has put forward a detailed budget which would, like the Republican plan, eliminate the deficit over 7 years. We have told them how to do it. But our budget doubles the spending for education and training and other human investments. We make education our first priority. We make education our first priority, and President Clinton has also proposed in his 10-year balanced budget plan to make education the first priority. His budget calls for a \$140 million over a 10-year period.

It is important that the American people understand that this attack on education and training by the present Republican majority is unprecedented. Every single Federal education training and education program on the books, all that exist now, were enacted with bipartisan support. We had both Republicans and Democrats agreeing. Former Vice President Dan Quayle, not a liberal Republican, not a moderate Republican but proudly a very conservative Republican, he wrote the Job Training Partnership Act, which is the principal job training program in existence now. When he was a Senator, Dan Quayle wrote the Job Training Partnership Act. Now the Republicans are trying to rewrite history and they attack the same Job Training Partnership Act as a failed Democratic program and they want to destroy it. We have always proceeded on a bipartisan basis with every education and training program since I have been in this Congress. We have taken exhaustive painstaking steps and we have made every effort, even when it was quite annoying, to achieve consensus on every bill that we brought forward to the floor. Neither Republicans nor Democrats were happy with every provision

of each bill that we passed over the last 13 years, but in their entirety each bill commanded overwhelming bipartisan support.

At the start of this Congress, many believed that this bipartisan approach would continue under the Republican majority. At least in the area of education and job training, we thought we could continue the bipartisan support. After all, education and job training had not been mentioned in the so-called Contract With America. That turned out to be purely wishful thinking. There has been no moderation and no bipartisanship. Our Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities has turned into an unrelenting attack dog for the radical right, intent on dismantling and disemboweling each and every education and training program which serves the American people. They even took the first step immediately to change the name of the committee. It has always been called the Committee on Education and Labor. But instead of Committee on Education and Labor, they chose to rename it Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, leaving out Labor. The word labor is not contained in the name of the full committee, and the word labor is not contained in the name of any of the subcommittees. The attack on labor, the ideological obsession with destroying labor began with the renaming of this committee.

Since January, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities has taken some of the following actions. We have gutted the school lunch program, as everybody knows. We have told the children of America, the Nation needs your lunch. It is not enough to feed all the hungry. If the money runs out before the end of the year in the case of block grants to the States, children will have to just go hungry. We have to, after all, maintain the money in the budget in order to give a tax cut of more than \$200 billion over a 7-year period to the richest Americans. We must save money. The Nation needs the lunch of school children in order to transfer those much-needed funds to the wealthiest Americans who need a tax cut. That is the plan of the controlling Republican majority.

They have repealed Federal child abuse prevention programs, also. Most of our State laws and programs designed to prevent and prosecute child abuse originated with a series of Federal laws enacted during the 1970's. These set out model laws, guidelines and programs and provided States with funds to implement them. By all accounts, it has been an extremely successful Federal-State partnership, improving the detection, the prosecution and the prevention of child abuse. Inexplicably and without a single hearing, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities has gutted all of these laws and taken away the assistance that is provided to States and community-based and parent orga-

nizations. Before we adjourn in August for recess, there are indications that this committee will add substantially to this already impressive catalog of carnage.

One of the bills that the committee proposes to act on is the elimination of the Department of Education. In 1995 in America at the end of the 20th century as we go toward the 21st century, they insist on pursuing this agenda of eliminating the Department of Education.

As I said before, our Nation does not have a strong and over centralized Department of Education to begin with. We have too little direction from the Federal level in education.

Now the Republicans are proposing to eliminate that. They will try to do it through the budget process, since they are not able to get agreement with the other body that they can eliminate it right away through an authorization process.

They want to eliminate all small programs. The committee also plans to repeal nearly every remaining elementary and secondary education program on the books. They want to replace them with a lump sum, unrestricted block grant.

The Republicans argue that many of these programs are too small to do any good and should be tossed out. The logic is bizarre. If a program is small and does not require much funding, if it is not hurting the balanced budget process, it is still tossed out. It is still destroyed because it is too small. You are either too large or too small.

B-2 bomber programs, programs to fund the B-2 bomber, on the other hand, are gigantic programs. I guess it is their size, the size of the B-2 bomber program, is what makes it attractive. We can see nothing else attractive about the B-2 bomber program; the B-2 bomber program, which will absorb about \$30 billion over the life of the program to build a bomber that nobody needs, that the President says he does not want, that the Secretary of Defense says he does not need, that the Air Force says they do not want.

Nobody wants the B-2 bomber, but the House of Representatives insists on including it in the budget, maybe because it is such a large program that the size of it, the gigantic nature of it, is attractive by itself. Small programs are considered evil, useless, they must be eliminated. But a gigantic program that nobody wants, that will cost \$30 billion or more, that at all costs we seek to retain. This is a kind of individual action that results from a vision of America which is distorted to begin with, a vision of America which is front-loaded to deal with the one-third elite population.

If you are going to be concerned with the elitists, then you insist that there be a tax cut of more than \$200 billion. If you going to be concerned with the elitists, you insist on the funding of a B-2 bomber. Who makes the profits on a B-2 bomber? The company that manufactures it, the district that is lucky

enough to get it as a plant where the planes or parts of it are going to be manufactured. You are playing to a very small group.

If you took the same \$30 billion and were to spend it in the civilian sector, you could create twice as many jobs. There are many studies that have been conducted and they all agree: Every dollar spent for military hardware would yield twice as many jobs if you spent them in the civilian sector. We could spend the B-2 bomber money any other way in the civilian sector and create jobs for twice as many people as are created by funding the B-2 bomber.

The assault on education is an assault which is partly driven by a concern for money, the desire to save money by cutting back on the Title I program, the Head Start program, the school lunch program. All the money you save by cutting these programs can be used to fund the more than \$200 billion tax cut for the rich, so we understand that that assault is driven by the need to get money to pay for the tax cut for the rich.

The assault on labor is not saving tremendous amounts of money. That is an ideologically driven assault, an assault which shows that the Contract With America is out of control. There are certain people who want to get revenge on labor. There are certain people who think that you can silence a large segment of America if you destroy organized labor which is at the core of the opposition.

So they have mounted this assault on labor unrelentingly starting with the Striker Replacement Act under the Democratic-controlled Congress. We twice passed a striker replacement act, which I call a right to strike act, because the provision in American labor law which allows employers to permanently replace workers, which is unlike any other industrialized nation except South Africa, that is a provision which takes away the right to strike. If you can be permanently replaced, then you really don't have the right to strike.

We passed a bill twice in the House of Representatives under Democratic control. We did have a President who signed it. Now we have a President who has taken the initiative. The President has ordered that in the area of government contracting, they will not contract with any employer who practices the permanent replacement of strikers. Any company that engages in the permanent replacement of strikers cannot do business with the Federal Government under the Executive order issued by the President of the United States.

That Executive order now has been challenged. Our committee, as part of its attack on labor, has proposed a bill to nullify the executive order on striker replacement. It was reported to the House by the full committee as H.R. 1176 on June 14, 1995.

Those of us who are on the committee, of course, we fought the passage of it. But the Republican majority has the numbers. So the President's order,

his Executive order which says that no contractor with the Federal Government would be allowed to practice the permanent replacement of strikers, that order is now under attack, and the committee has reported to the full House now a bill which will strike down and nullify the executive order of the President.

□ 2215

That is an unprecedented step, by the way. Congress very seldom takes steps to nullify an Executive order of a President.

Another bill that they have passed out of the full Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, which used to be called the Education and Labor Committee, as part of the attack on labor, we passed what we call the Team Act. The full committee ordered H.R. 743, the Team Act, favorably reported on Thursday, June 22.

The Team Act can be called more accurately the Company Union Act. The Team Act sets up a situation where companies can establish their own union. Nothing is more dangerous for unions than to have the employers, the management, be able to pick the people they want to bargain with and who they want to work with. The Team Act could be called the Company Union Act, and that is passed as part of the assault on labor. It has come out of the committee and has been reported to the floor.

The OSHA reform, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, as I said before, is under attack. The OSHA reforms that have been proposed by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BALLENGER, he has introduced a bill, which is H.R. 1834, entitled, "A Comprehensive Reform of OSHA," which could be better described as a death and injury act. It really guts the enforcement of OSHA and makes OSHA into an agency which has no viability. They cannot enforce any of their rules or their standards if they follow the procedures that are established in this act by Mr. BALLENGER and the subcommittee. That has been introduced and is still in the process of holding hearings.

The Fair Labor Standards Act reform is also under the Workforce Protection Subcommittee chaired by Mr. BALLENGER, and they are proposing, first of all, to gut the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Child labor sections of the act will be dealt with later. They are starting by gutting the most important provisions related to workers, and that is the provision for overtime. That is part of the assault on labor that has gone forward.

Minimum wage. They refuse to deal with minimum wage at all. It is a negative assault on labor. By refusing to consider minimum wage or allowing any legislation to be considered which increases the minimum wage, they are assaulting two-thirds of the population out there suffering from increases in cost of living, living under an obsolete minimum wage standard.

The President and the Democratic leadership of the Congress are sponsoring an increase in the minimum wage of 90 percent over a 2-year period. That is our answer to the assault on the wages of workers.

The Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act, Davis-Bacon Service Contract Act protect workers when they are on government contracts. They must be paid the prevailing wages of a given area while they are working on a government contract program.

This was a program that was developed by Republicans. Mr. Davis was a Republican; Mr. Bacon was a Republican. It has been legislation always supported by Republicans previously. But now this revolutionary Republican majority wants to wipe out totally, repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

Fortunately, they have not been able to do this through authorization, so one of the appropriations bills, the Transportation Subcommittee, has placed in the appropriations bill a provision cutting off all funds for the enforcement of Davis-Bacon on projects related to transportation. That is part of the assault on labor.

On and on it goes. The assault on labor, the assault on education, the two primary programs necessary for two-thirds of Americans to survive those are unrelenting, and it must be stopped. It is quite tragic that the vision, the vision that is driving the Republican majority is a vision which is a danger for two-thirds of the population.

Any vision for the future that caters to only a small percentage and refuses to endorse the principle of sharing the riches of our Nation, any such elite, selfish vision is a danger to the America of the future.

Oh, beautiful and spacious skies and acres and miles of rich, productive farmland, this is America which God has been quite good to. God is good to America, and America should be good to its people by sharing the great wealth. Hills and mountains full of gold, silver, copper, and uranium for energy; nature yields so much to America.

This is a land where democracy flourishes, a land with a written Constitution that establishes the framework for law and order, and the peace that comes as a result of that law and order makes rapid, unbroken progress possible. With all of the flaws and faults of our American system, we still have the best government that man has ever conceived.

America with political freedom and a free marketplace, a land where science and technology expand with infinite possibilities. This great America, preserved and protected by thousands of nameless soldiers who fought the tyranny of Tojo in Asia and the tyranny of Hitler in Europe; this America made available to all of us by God, nature and the accidents of history; this America protected and perfected by so many from George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and millions of unpaid

slaves who helped to build it. Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, and all of the soldiers known and unknown, who fought to hold on to our freedoms and our opportunities. This America belongs to all of us.

This is the America which we have to envisage; this is the America which you have to fight to keep; this is the America that the elite minority wants to destroy: The workers, the wage-earners, the salary workers, the small business people, the executives, the owners. This America does not belong to any one group, this belongs to all of the Americans.

The elite oppressive minority shall not prevail. This America belongs to all of us, and we will fight to keep it. We must fight the assault on education; we must fight the assault on labor. We must fight to preserve the America for all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share a dialog with my colleagues on issues that are very important.

We have talked to a great extent this evening and throughout the week about reform issues. One of the issues that I think is the most exciting that has taken place this week is one where Congressman SMITH from the State of Washington has introduced landmark legislation today, which is in fact going to help revolutionize and improve the credibility, I believe, of campaigns nationally, and I hope that she is successful.

I would ask you, Congresswoman SMITH, if you could tell us the background of why you have brought this legislation forward, and what you hope to accomplish.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for being one of the first people to stand up and say, this makes sense and I want to sign on the bill, and the gentleman is an original sponsor and a brave man in this place to make this change.

This particular change is revolutionary. The reason it had to happen is this is a new Congress. We are doing business different. We are cleaning house, we have changed procedures. We had a major audit of everything going on, and now we need a new way of running campaigns. The old way just will not work any more.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentlewoman will yield, I think that is what the public said last November. They stated that they not only wanted the Congress to run better, be more accountable, spend less taxes and also spend less money, but they also said, what about cleaning up campaigns so that it is returned to the people and not controlled by special interests.

Please tell us a little bit more about the background, if you would.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in Washington State, in 1992, after 4 hard years, we finally passed campaign reform, similar to what I am introducing here, and that many of our Members are already rallying around. What it did is it says, no money from outside your State. It limited PACs severely to where they are there, but they do not talk a lot with money. It eliminated gift places, they were called, office funds, but it is where lobbyists gave gifts so you could buy stereos and fancy clothes and things like that, and it said, no fund-raising while the legislature is in session. If you are voting, the money for your campaign should be contributed far, far away from voting. Therefore, it said no fund-raising. We are only in session there a few months, but it said, no fund-raising during the month before or the month after. So it sterilized.

Mr. Speaker, what this does is about the same. It says, no money from outside your State. No more PAC money, no more D.C. fund-raisers. You go back home, you campaign at home; no more gifts, no more trips.

We are going to change the culture. We are not going to ask all of the people here to jump in and change with their opponents, running back home and playing under the old set of rules. We are going to call unilaterally to disarm at a time certain to where everybody changes the rules and returns campaigns home.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Is it not true, Congresswoman SMITH, that you are going to level the playing field so that it will not be just incumbents that get reelected, it will be actually the best candidate winning based on merit and not who has the biggest war chest?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Definitely. And I think what is going to be hard for this place to get used to is some of the folks have been here 20, 30 years, and some more than that. They have homes established here. Good people. They raised their children here. They have not had to spend as much time in their districts. They go back, they represent their people, but they do not spend much time there, or have to spend much time there. This will force them to go home.

Then in the election year, if your opponent is out there in the streets going door-to-door and they are going out and saying, elect me, it will probably mean this Congress is not in session as much, and those people will have to spend more time in their States, which I think is really effective.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentlewoman will yield, they have to be more accountable back to the people.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Yes. But it will be kind of scary.

This is revolutionary, but I think just like in Washington State, both sides of the aisle, both parties, everybody fought it for a long time. When they finally decided, some of them before it was passed, and some after, that it was OK, now they love it. Because no

money can talk while they are voting. Lobbyists can talk with persuasion instead of their checkbooks. Now you will find that most people in Washington State just cannot imagine going back under the old money system.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, what has been the rate of growth as your staff and you have brought these facts together for the House, both Republicans and Democrats? What is the total PAC contributions to House campaigns that the gentlewoman has charted here for us tonight?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I just happened to bring a chart to show the gentleman.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is good.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. As the gentleman will see, in 1984, just 10 years ago, a little over, there were \$80 million a year given by PACs, and now it is \$132 million. I think what is significant about that is, and I should have another chart, it is four-to-one to incumbents. So what has happened, except for the little blip last year where some of us were, as I was, a write-in candidate, but some folks really had to take on an incumbent, and it was rare that an incumbent could go out even under a really good challenge. Because first of all, the incumbent had unlimited mailing, which we limit in this and do not let them mail 90 days before the primary and 90 days after.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentlewoman will yield, what is the House rule now?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. It is 60 days, and we are going to tighten it down so that it is even tighter.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. So what you have going to be able to do now is make sure that the newsletters or any other communications from an incumbent will actually be related back to governmental work as opposed to those items which are just being sent out in an attempt to be reelected.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is right. If you are trying to level the playing field and you are driving campaigns home and you do it all, but you leave the unlimited franking or reasonably unlimited franking, what happens is the incumbent has these great ideas about twice a week to send out to their colleagues to build their idea. If the idea is that great, it certainly is good in the first year of your term and not just extra good in the last. What we have found is that most of the franking is spent in the latter part of the term instead of the first part.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If I understand correctly, not only is your legislation going to limit the time period by which franked mail can be sent, but as a result of your efforts and the other reformers that have worked with you in the House, we have now cut by one-third the amount of mail that can be franked generally for House Members.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is right. It will work really well, because



we will still be able to communicate, even ask people to come to town halls with fliers and things like that. They will not need as much in the next year, because we are going to cut out what they would mail when this passes. Therefore, it changes politics as usual in the year of the election, but still lets you work with your constituents and communicate with them.

What we will see is what we saw in Washington State: campaigns dropped in cost by a third in one election cycle after the campaign measure passed, and it did not come from people. People's contributions went up, in fact. They realized they were really players.

It came out of the 15 big. Those are the big corporate, the big labor and the big trial lawyer groups, real estate agent groups, all of those groups. All of a sudden they could not give like they could before, and it dropped campaign costs by a third. It dropped campaign costs for all candidates, so there was an equal playing field.

□ 2230

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. With regard to the political action committees, or PAC's, as you discussed what percentage have they been of incumbents' campaigns as relates to other expenditures?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I have just got 1994, but this seems to be pretty consistent. Incumbents were getting 53 percent of their contributions from individuals and 44 percent from PAC's and less than 3 percent from parties. Challengers, on the other hand, were getting 11 percent from PACs.

When you take a look at this, obviously PAC's really weighed in heavily for incumbents and not near as heavy for challengers. If you want to win as a challenger, you had to get a lot more individuals, but this will change. In Washington State it just changed substantially.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. As far as the charts there, this is the 1994 figures, the most recent campaigns then. You found, based on what happened in Washington State, that you had a dramatic change in the culture there? Is that right?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What happened in Washington State that you are saying today to the American people we think is going to change for Congress as well?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. We returned campaigns to people. Instead of the legislature operating with fundraisers and evening events and worrying about lobbyists' contributions, they were able to get about business. Instead of having the first few weeks right before the session started with dozens of campaign fundraisers every day, they were able to plan an agenda, because they could not raise money. Instead of the incumbent mass mailing in the last year to be sure they were re-elected, they had to get out and get amongst people because they could not

do it anymore. It did what we wanted to do. We had to return these campaigns to people and get them away from PAC's.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Part of the reform effort we have seen in the freshman class as a Republican has been the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK]. I would ask him to enter our colloquy and give us what he thinks is going to be really the next step.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Thank you very much for the gentleman yielding. I associate my comments with the gentleman from Washington and her comments about campaign finance reform, the excellent work she has done in the State of Washington. I think that can carry over to Washington, DC. We need to get this sort of reform taking place. I think the first step about being able to do that is bringing these sort of facts and figures out and bringing to the American people how campaigns are financed, how the system so much favors the incumbent. That is why a number of us support term limits. For one reason, the system so favors incumbents, this is the only way you can get at the system is through term limits.

Another thing, another key portion of it is the campaign finance system. You can see the difference between incumbents and challengers on the chart the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] puts forward.

I want to say this is a very, very important thing to look at. The American people, on November 8, 1994, said to us, "Look, clean your own House up. Make the government smaller. Get that place under control. Return the people's House to the people." That to me is a lot of what this is about, returning the people's House to the people, having them fund it, having them finance it, having them see and be the focus of our point.

When I go back to eastern Kansas where I represent and where I ran during the campaign, the people kept saying all the time during the campaign, "Don't forget us, don't forget us." It seemed like an odd question to me. "Why do you think we'd forget you?" Then you start getting around the system and how it is built and how it is funded, how it operates, you see pretty quick why the people are scared we are going to forget them. I think the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is on target. I applaud her efforts.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I wanted to ask the gentlewoman further, your legislation does more than change the culture with regard to campaigns and how they are run and leveling the playing field for challengers, but this gift ban where we actually have lobbyists give lunches or golf and things like that, which the public does not appreciate nor understand, what would your bill do in a forward way?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You know, I think you keep saying my bill.

This is several of our bills, yours, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], but the gift ban section come from an earlier bill that we introduced, the three of us, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], myself, and you earlier in session, and I think either one of you could explain just as well as I can. But it obviously just abolishes gifts, but I would certainly yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] to probably explain that just as well as I can, probably better, because he has championed this issue.

Mr. BROWNBACK. The gift ban is pretty simple. It is a "just say no" gift ban. That is just simple, saying "no" to gifts. The American people in many respects think the institution is bought and paid for sometimes by very small gifts and trinkets, other times by very big things, and the gift ban legislation says "just say no," do not accept it, you do not need to take it, why have it. We are paid a reasonable salary, and we get reasonable pay for what we do here. Why do we need to have all of these gifts, plus why are we given gifts in the first place? Is there something going on untold that takes place? Some people think it is, some not.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. It could be you are so handsome, both of you, but I think it is something else.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. It has more to do with what we are voting on.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is right. I do have something I want to ask you. We have both got pressure on it from other Members. There is a lot of concern about the provisions that eliminate all trips from special interests or any group wanting to lobby this place. Address that, and why we all made that decision, because some of our colleagues are real concerned about the change, away from, to no trips.

Mr. BROWNBACK. To me, the reason for it is very clear and very simple, and that is that frequently institutions or groups will seek to fly somebody as a Member of Congress to a particular place to be able to catch his ear for a longer period of time. I do not think people here are bought and sold for a trip. That does not take place. They get then additional time for the ability to influence a particular Member of Congress on a particular point of view. The people we represent do not get the same chance to do that. That is the idea with this. I do not think Members should be particularly scared about this provision at all, that this is something that we are saying if it is a reasonable trip, if it is worthwhile, we have travel accounts that are associated with this. If there are things that can be used that way, that that is the way that he ought to go with it, but it goes back to the people not trusting what takes place in the House of Representatives. This is their House. We are the people. We are the freshest from the folks. They are saying they do not trust it. Here is another way to try



to say, OK, there are some institutional flaws with it. Let us get rid of those. Let us get about our job and let us move on down the road. I think we can operate a very strong House of Representatives without these gifts being given.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Another reason why I think this makes sense is no one really comes here with the idea, "I want to be in Congress to have a trip or a gift," and no one would come for that purpose, no one would stay for that purpose. Let us get rid of them, restore the confidence and credibility of the institution, along with the other kinds of reforms that are institutionally being made, whether it be legal reform, welfare reform, regulatory reform, all the things that help make the country work better, make sure that Government is more responsive by leading by example within this institution on the gift ban and reforms of campaigns; you are going to attract some quality people who never would have run before.

With term limits, they will all follow us in Congress, revitalize it and make it a stronger, more accountable place.

Mr. BROWNBAC. On that point, that is absolutely true, and plus one thing I would add, in a representative democracy, it is critical that people have trust and faith in the representative and the representative system. They have lost that faith. We have got to do what we can to restore that.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Well, you could not have said it any better. I have been wrestling with ways; a lot of amendments, a lot of the bills that have come forward on ethics in campaign and gifts have come from well-intentioned people, and they try so hard to get a bill that will make the people here happy and, and you go through the exceptions, and they might have some logic to them for some person, but when you put them all together and each of these bills that have come before us have exceptions, then there is still the problem of the appearance of evil. We know that most of our colleagues here are pretty honest people. Only a few break rules or are dishonest. They are here to do a good job.

But the American people look at it and go, "Just change," and I think that we cannot any longer just mickey with the system. I think we just have to change it to show them we are really a new Congress, a clean Congress.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. In terms of the legislation filed today and discussed before the press corps of Washington, where do you see the next step? How is it going to be passed? Many people who are entrenched in Washington do not want to see it. How will passage come besides having our support? Where do you think it is really going to have a maximum effort?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. It is going to come from the American people. It is going to come from the American people. Our plan, as you know, is to go to large groups of Americans, or-

ganized groups and small groups, and bring them together and make sure that they lobby their legislator and tell them what they want. If they do not deliver the votes on this, this time next year we will be having the same debate because this place will not change itself. One thing we know after November, this place is really interested in what the voters think. We know they put us in, watching us, and I know they can take us out, and they are not going to accept the old. We have given them a taste of the new, of the change, of the clean Government. We have audited this place. We have reduced staff. We have opened up doors and blown out cobwebs that have never been there before, and they now know we can do it, and I do not think they are going to accept anything else but a cleaning.

Next month the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBAC] and myself will be speaking to the United We Stand conference in Dallas, with nearly 10,000 activists from around the Nation. You will be contacting groups, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], and we will each individually divide up the Nation and get people to work this bill. People will deliver it, or it will not happen. We are going to do our part. I am going to do my part, and you both are.

But it will take people.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Like what you did in Washington State, I say to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH]; that is how we will succeed here.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. The people let us not.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. One at a time. The people will make a difference. I could reflect also on another item today where reforms like yours being introduced, in fact, we came to fruition, one of the major items that we talked about on day one was to have a House audit so we could find out what the books were like and what the finances were of our own House for the first time ever. I would ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBAC] for his force reflections on where we are at this point, what has been discovered, and where we go from here.

Mr. BROWNBAC. On day one of this new Congress, we said there were a number of reforms we would pass. One of those things on day one we said we would do was audit the House of Representatives for the first time in the history of this institution, long overdue, particularly when you consider this is the place that has had a House post office scandal, a bank scandal, a restaurant scandal, and any other number, and yet we did not need to have an audit. Well, yes, it needed an audit and we have had an audit released today.

We told people on that opening day, and we told the auditors, "Follow your noses. See what you find in this particular audit, in this situation." Price Waterhouse, a private major account-

ing firm in this country, had over 100 auditors auditing the House of Representatives for the past, since that time, since January 4 when we passed that, and they only looked back at the past 15 months for as far as when we took over in November 1994, they looked back 15 months, so they are just talking about a time period from the middle of 1993 to November 1994, and auditing this institution back through that period of time. I think they need to go back further and look more thoroughly at this.

But today they released this report, and it was a scathing indictment of the institution and the institutional failures, so much so that these auditors could not issue an opinion as to the fiscal soundness or the financial situation of the House of Representatives. They could not even issue an opinion. They said the records are so bad, they said we had two sets of books during this time period. Now, this is under the old Congress. This is under the Congress that was controlled by one party for 40 years in a row, so two sets of books. We could not find the audit trail sufficiently to be able to tell you what the financial conditions of the House of Representatives is today. They said that if this was a private business, you could not get a loan, because we could not say if your books were solid or not and, furthermore, you would be bankrupt.

They said if you were a governmental institution, which this place is, you would have violated the law since 1990. We are on cash basis accounting. The whole Government went to accrual basis accounting the year I was born except for the House of Representatives.

Now, this is itself a massive indictment of what took place financially in this institution, and this is just a 15-month window that we have examined, and that is coming out today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I also noticed in my copy of the report, which went to each Member, and it was a bipartisan initiative, it showed that actually bills had not been paid, equipment was not accounted for, and there were security problem with the computer system, within the internal system. I was happy to see at the end of the day, and I am sure you were as well, that every single Member of this Chamber voted to have the inspector general do the followup work required, hopefully with your help and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] we will be able to go backward in time sufficiently suitable enough so we can get the other information we need so we do not see these institutional errors continue.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, you know, I looked at this, and again I am an optimist. I though how great we have the opportunity to change it, and this is a Congress that will. You know we can look back and spend a lot of time on being made, but we can look forward

and we can say we know what is wrong and we can make changes.

But also I felt really good because many of the things recommended when it came to Government costs in this is too much, barbershops, beauty shops, all of those things we had already started fixing, the printing costs, all of those. I felt good we had already started changing. I felt good we could see where we could change, and that I believe we can move forward. And I also felt good that we are not as partisan as I have seen in the past and in other layers of Government. We are giving it to an outside counsel to look at. We are not playing around with it. We are not holding our own hearings on it. We are just saying, "Here, you take it, and you followup on this," and I was proud of us for doing that. I think that was a very wise move for this institution to take, to not politically make this a football.

Mr. BROWNBACK. If the gentlewoman would yield for just a moment, I think those are absolutely appropriate comments, and that is what the American people want us to do. They want us to clean our own house up first. They want us to produce a smaller Federal Government, clean up the House of Representatives, and return to the basic values that built the country, and we are getting a good start on doing those things.

I am just amazed that when I ran for Congress, and I ran a lot saying, "We're got to change Congress," I did not comment about—enough about how bad the institution had—

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Did not even know.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes, I guess I didn't realize it, but to never have been audited, to have this sort of lack of ability to even be able to render an opinion, I mean the financial situation just stinks.

What I am happy to see is we have blown the lid off of that. OK; it is no longer just this hidden little dirty secret that is only known around Washington.

Look, here is the audit. I have got some summaries here. The audit is inches thick that we have released out today. Here is what it is, folks. Let us get to the bottom of this, and at least we have blown open the lids on the Capitol, and given the people's House back to the people, and to me this is part about reestablishing the faith of the American people in representative democracy which we absolutely have to do to continue to make the tough choices for the future of our great Nation, which I was just home in Kansas, and I was down in Pittsburg, KS, this past weekend, and people there are saying:

"I'm scared for our Nation."

"I'm scared for our future."

What's going to take place in the future of this country?"

Because they are just fearful we are going to be self-serving, we are not going to take care of the real business

we need to, we are not going to clean up the House, and this is a further statement:

"No, we are."

It is a start. We passed the audit bill. Here is the first installment. We are going to continue on it, and we have got to get the bad odor out of the place that we are finally started on.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fact that what is really clear here is that not only are we talking about reforming Government, and that is downsizing, privatizing, consolidating, eliminating agencies which have become bloated or duplicating what is in local governments, much with your work with the New Federalists, Congressman BROWNBACK and Congresswoman SMITH, but what we are also doing is, like you said earlier, the institution itself has become so inbred with the problems of the books having two systems, of having no change, kind of the status quo was maintained. We have a new sign on this House, said the status quo no longer lives here. Everyone is allowed to question everything.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker and the leadership is saying to freshmen, "Please question the system," and that goes for the American public. If they got something they think where the Federal Government is off base, we are here as Representatives in Congress and the Senate so we can make those fundamental changes in the institution, in the Federal Government. We want to be more responsive, more accountable, spend less money, do more to help businesses grow, produce, and hire, give individuals to be all they can be as well, and by listening to the American public, going back as often as you do to Kansas and LINDA does, Congresswoman SMITH, to Washington, we will start hearing those kinds of suggestions which will be institutional as well as governmental.

Mr. BROWNBACK. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] that is also in our class, he has a saying that he uses from his grandmother. It says: "If you always do what you always done, you'll always get what you always got."

It is her statement, and what I am so pleased about is that we are not just doing what we always done. The standard thing to do would be to say, OK, when you take over, "Well, let's not really look at the books, the audits. You might get at your own Members. You might get at some people you don't want to."

No, no, we are going to audit the place. The thing we have to do now is be vigilant and make sure that this sticks, that the next time the auditors look at this place, and we do an annual audit, and they look at an audit, they can issue an opinion where the House of Representatives is, and they will not say this place stinks, which is what the auditor said today basically.

I was in the committee where they released the information, and they were saying they cannot compare this

to any other institution they have ever audited previously. I mean it has its own set of records, and it seems to serve its members more than be interested in accountability. It was the auditors' own statement. Well, that is a staining indictment on the system. I am glad to say that that system is being thrown out—

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. As far as I am concerned, we got a breath of fresh air coming through the Congress today not only with the audit, but with the legislation of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] to get a new perspective. This may be a catalyst for change in government reform, political campaign reform, in gift ban, and I was just speaking to a taxi driver earlier this evening. He said:

"You know, I like it the way the place is being questioned now." He said, "I'm reading more books on history. I'm looking into what the Government's doing. I'm glad that you freshmen are questioning things that I always thought should be questioned, and you're doing it, and whether you're a Republican or Democrat in this 104th Congress, things will get better, you'll be more accountable, and you're listening more to the folks back home."

I think they want to make sure we continue doing it.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes, and if the gentleman would yield, that is the key to representative democracy, and they feel like all they have had is more of an imperial Congress than a representative democracy. We have got to continue. That is why campaign finance reform, gift ban, the continuation of the audit. Let us continue to looking forward and backward at what is taking place. We have got to reestablish that trust and faith in the American people and this institution.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a brief statement, I think though that we have to remember that we will only be able to do it if the American people are behind us and pushing. This place still have rooms that need to be cleaned, and it gets to be real hard for the oldtimers when they see so much happening, and so the American people are going to have to call and say, "We want the Brownback-Smith-Fox or the Fox-Smith-Brownback Clean Campaign Act." They have to do that. They have to say, "We want the Clean Campaign Act." They need to call their Members and tell them that, if they do not do that, it will not happen because this is going to be a tough change.

When we get into this audit, they need to commend us for doing it, not point fingers at all of us for cleaning it up, and we need the support of the American people. This is going to be a tough job, and we cannot do it by ourselves.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Well, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] for their participation in this special

order tonight which dealt with reforming the Congress, and for keeping the revolution alive, and we thank them for their efforts and leadership.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) from 2:30 p.m. today through Wednesday, July 19, on account of the death of his father.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FATTAH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH, today, for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY, today, for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BALLENGER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK, today, for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEASTRAND, on July 20, for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, today, for 5 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FATTAH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SKELTON in five instances.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. RUSH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. WOLF.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 457. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to update references in the classification of children for purposes of United States immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 523. An act to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 19, 1995, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1219. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to the Taipei economic and cultural representative in the United States [TECRO] (Transmittal No. 29-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1220. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1221. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Review of the Award and Administration of Parking Ticket Processing and Delinquent Ticket Collection Services Contracts," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1222. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations and Benefits, District of Columbia Retirement Board, transmitting the financial disclosure statement of a board member, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-732 and 1-734(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1223. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on the Administration of Elections for Federal Office, 1993-1994," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1973gg-7; to the Committee on House Oversight.

1224. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1225. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of pro-

posed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1226. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1227. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Territorial and International Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Pacific Insular Fisheries Empowerment Act of 1995"; to the Committee on Resources.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 714. A bill to establish the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-191, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1943. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to deem certain municipal wastewater treatment facilities discharging into ocean waters as the equivalent of secondary treatment facilities (Rept. 104-192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEACH: Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 1858. A bill to reduce paperwork and additional regulatory burdens for depository institutions; with an amendment (Rept. 104-193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### BILLS PLACED ON THE CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

Under clause 4 of rule XIII, the Speaker filed with the Clerk a notice requesting that the following bills be placed upon the Corrections Calendar:

H.R. 1943. To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to deem certain municipal wastewater treatment facilities discharging into ocean waters as the equivalent of secondary treatment facilities.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LONGLEY:

H.R. 2049. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 33 College Avenue in Waterville, ME, as the "George J. Mitchell Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana:

H.R. 2050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for interest on higher education loans and to permit penalty-free withdrawals from qualified retirement plans to pay for higher education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed